

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



On the Problem of the Bacchae.

A. W. Verral

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 03 / March 1894, pp 85 - 89

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187517, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187517

How to cite this article:

A. W. Verral (1894). On the Problem of the Bacchae.. The Classical Review, 8, pp 85-89
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187517

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

95. ναύφρακτον: ὁ ναυτικός στρατὸς ναύφρακτος καλεῖται. σκώπτων οὖν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ σοβαρῶς καὶ μόλις προσιέναι ταῦτά φησι· 'πότερον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τὸ ναυτικὸν ἔχων οὕτω βαδίζεις;' Ald. Did this annotator also read *νωθρῶς*?

95. ναύφρακτον: λιμένα. Hesych.

95. ναύφαρκτον βλέπεις: ἐπειδὴ μεγάλοι ταῖς τριήρεσιν ὀφθαλμοὶ γίνονται δι' ὧν τὰς κόπας ἐμβάλλοντες ἐκωπλιάτουν· ἐφράττοντο δὲ καὶ δερματίνοις τρόποις πρὸς τὸ μὴ τρίβεσθαι τὰ σανιδώματα. Ald., cp. Suidas.

95. ναύφαρκτον βλέπεις: φησὶν <Ἀριστοφάνης> ἐπὶ τοῦ περιηθροῦντος καὶ σεμνῶς ἰόντος. Photius.

95. ναύσταθμον: τὸν λιμένα. Suidas.

96. ἡ περὶ ἄκραν κάμπτων: τηνικαῦτα γὰρ μάλιστα εἰώθασιν προορᾶν καὶ φυλάττειν τὴν ναὺν ὁπότεν ἄκραν τινὰ κάμπτωσιν. Ald.

97. ἄσκωμα: ὡς δέρματα ἐξηρητημένα <ἔχοντος> τοῦ μύστακος καὶ τῆς ῥινὸς καὶ οὕτω ἔσκευασμένον γέλωτος χάριν. Rav.

97. ἄσκωμ' ἔχεις κ.τ.λ.: ὡς τοῦ δέρματος ἐξηρητημένου τοῦ μύστακος καὶ τῆς ῥινὸς καὶ οὕτως γελοῖως ἔσκευασμένου. Ald.

97. ἄσκωμ' ἔχεις κ.τ.λ.: ἔσκευασμένος ἦν ὁ Πέρσης ἔχων καθειμένον εἰς τόπον (= in lieu) τοῦ τε πώγωνος καὶ τοῦ στόματος, ὡς ἂν προσωπεῖον. Ald.

97. ἄσκωμα: ἄσκωμα ὁ ἰμάς ὁ συνέχων τὴν κόπην πρὸς τῷ σκαλμῷ. Rav., Ald.

97. ἄσκωμα: ὁ τῆς κόπης ὀφθαλμὸς ἔχει

τὸ ἄσκωμα (Ald.). κόπης δὲ ὀφθαλμὸς τὸ τρήμα. Ald., Rav.

It may be well to add here the remainder of the Aldine Scholia on lines 94–97, which, for want of space, have had to be omitted from the specimen page:—

ΑΛΛΩΣ· ὁ ναυτικός στρατὸς, ναύφρακτος καλεῖται· σκώπτων οὖν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ σοβαρῶς καὶ μόλις προσιέναι ταῦτά φησι. πότερον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τὸ ναυτικὸν ἔχων οὕτω βαδίζεις, ἢ ναὺν ἀκρωτήριον κάμπτουσαν· ἐπειδὴ δεδοικότες οἱ ἐμπλέοντες, ὅταν ὦσι πλησίον τῆς γῆς, ἡρέμα καὶ ἐπιστημόνως ἰθύνουσι, μὴ προσπταίσωσι τῇ γῇ· ἐσκευασμένος δὲ ἦν ὁ Πέρσης, δέρμα ἔχων καθειμένον, εἰς τόπον τοῦ τε πώγωνος καὶ τοῦ στόματος, ὡς ἂν προσωπεῖον. ἄλλως· ἔξεισι τερατώδης τις γελοῖως ἔσκευασμένος καὶ ὀφθαλμὸν ἔχων ἓνα ἐπὶ παντὸς τοῦ προσώπου. ἡ περὶ ἄκραν κάμπτων· τηνικαῦτα γὰρ μάλιστα εἰώθασιν προορᾶν καὶ φυλάττειν τὴν ναὺν, ὁπότεν ἄκραν τινὰ κάμπτωσι· νεώριον οὖν φησι περιβλέπεις· ἐν ᾧ νεωλκήσεις· οἶκον δὲ νεὺς, ὃ καλοῦσιν ἀγκῶνα· ἡ μᾶλλον ὑποκρύφους τόπους διὰ τὸν ἀνεμον· ἐνθα ὑπὸ σκέπη εἰσὶν ἄσκωμ' ἔχεις· ὡς τοῦ δέρματος ἐξηρητημένου τοῦ μύστακος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ῥινὸς, καὶ οὕτως γελοῖως ἔσκευασμένου. ἄσκωμα δὲ, ὁ ἰμάς ὁ συνέχων τὴν κόπην, πρὸς τῷ σκαλμῷ. ἄλλως· ὁ τῆς κόπης ὀφθαλμὸς, ἔχει τὸ ἄσκωμα· κόπης δὲ ὀφθαλμὸς τὸ τρήμα.

W. G. RUTHERFORD.

ON THE PROBLEM OF THE *BACCHAE*.

(*À propos of Recent Editions.*)

BESIDE the recent school-edition of the *Bacchae* by Professor Tyrrell,¹ which itself had rivals in the field, yet another has now been placed by Mr. Cruickshank of New College.² The new volume is entitled to that measure of praise at which it appears to aim, that is to say, the editor is a competent scholar, the notes are kept within a very moderate compass, and the student who holds by them will not be imperilled in his examination. It is not an interesting or a stimulating book, such as Professor Tyrrell's. It is composed on a principle common in books of this kind and, whether correct or not, defensible, that the business

of an expounder for inexperienced students is not to provoke investigation, but to give always, if possible, a 'safe' explanation, an explanation which has sufficient authority to pass. The only question is, whether students so entirely dependent, that they must be treated in this way, are really ready for the *Bacchae*. To take one salient and characteristic example. In a well-known passage (v. 1066 foll.) the tree bent down to receive Pentheus is compared to some curve exhibited by the use of a *τόρνος*. Mr. Cruickshank explains the *τόρνος* to be a simple kind of compass, a peg and string. No hint is given that there is any other explanation, or that this one is open to any objection more serious than that 'the

¹ Macmillan's Classical Series, 1892.

² Clarendon Press, 1893.

simile is prosaic.' Now this view, that the comparison is between the bent tree and a circular curve, such as that of a wheel, has certainly the merit of having been many times repeated in respectable books, and being therefore technically 'safe': it has this merit and no other. If it were right, the only educational aid which a student could derive from the simile would be the perception of its infelicity and inadequacy; and the only useful note could be one which exposed this defect. The objection, which has been several times alleged and is well known, is not that the simile is, if it be, prosaic, but that it is no simile at all; that there is no resemblance worth notice between the illustration and the thing illustrated. The line produced by bending down a pine-tree or pine-bough would indeed be essentially like that of a bow, to which Euripides first likens it, but with a circle, or the outline of a wheel, it would have no affinity whatever, except that both are curved lines, not straight. The image therefore darkens, instead of enlightening, the intelligence of the auditor, and is an offence against the principles of poetry and sense. This is not the place to set out the wholly different explanation of the *τόπος* offered by Mr. Robertson first in 1879 (*Hermathena* iii. 387) and reproduced with full detail in Professor Tyrrell's edition, which Mr. Cruickshank has consulted. Right or wrong, it really is an adequate explanation of the passage and really does offer an object by which Euripides, if he had it in mind, might naturally have thought it worth while to explain his picture of the bent pine. It may perhaps not yet be considered a 'safe' explanation, that is to say, it is not universally familiar, and a student reproducing it, in the imperfect style of an examination paper, might conceivably be punished as if for nonsense by an examiner not well prepared. But is this a sufficient reason, not merely for suppressing it, but for propounding the damaged alternative as if it were unimpeachable? What benefit is thus conferred, and on whom, which compensates for the retardation of the general intelligence, and how long must this conservative attitude be maintained?

To accumulate instances of this kind would scarcely be interesting to the readers of the *Review*, and here I should have ended, if it were not that there is one instance, which will take us right to the heart of Euripides' work, and will expose not merely the variations of individual editors but the whole present position of Euripidean

criticism, and the direction in which it should move.

ἰκοίμαν ποτὶ Κύπρον,
νᾶσον τὰς Ἀφροδίτας,
ἐν ᾧ θελξίφρονες νέμονται θνατοῖσιν Ἑρωτες,
Πάφον θ', ἃν ἐκατόστομοι
βαρβάρων ποταμοῦ ῥοαὶ
καρπίζουσιν ἀνομβροί.
ὅπου δ' ἂ καλλιστενομένα
Πιερίᾳ μούσειος ἔδρα,
σεμνὰ κλιτὺς Ὀλύμπου,
ἐκεῖσ' ἄγε με, Βρόμειε, <Βρόμειε>,
προβακχίῃ δαίμον.
ἐκεῖ Χάριτες, ἐκεῖ δὲ Πόθος·
ἐκεῖ δὲ βάκχαισι θέμις ὀργιάζειν.
(*Bacch.* 402.)

Such in all points of substance is the MS. reading of this passage except that in the third line for ἐν ᾧ (Nauck) both MSS. have ἵνα, and some after Heath print ἵν' οἱ: this question for the present purpose may be ignored. The monstrous difficulty, which immediately confronts us, is that Paphos is said to be fertilized by the Nile, an assertion as absurd—rather more—as if Dover were said to be fertilized by the Scheldt. It is true that no alternative reading or explanation has been as yet established, and it is apparently on this ground that Mr. Cruickshank, faithful to the conservative method, does his best to tide the ignorant or the careless over the objection by such curiously mild phrases as that 'the poet's geography was not accurate,' or that 'many editors' have thought the language 'more appropriate' to Egypt. Did any ever think otherwise, or what, if they did, is the value of their opinion? But here at all events the method seems to be exaggerated or misapplied. Dr. Sandys is content to mark the place as corrupt; Professor Tyrrell emends it; Elmsley was not afraid to say that he had no guess of the meaning. Safety now lies, if anywhere, in the simple statement that the text is nonsense.

Of the attempts to mend it by far the most skilful and the most plausible is that of Professor Tyrrell—Πάφον θ', ἃν θ' κ.τ.λ.: 'Oh that I might go to Cyprus...and Paphos, and to [the land] which the Nile makes fertile' that is, to Egypt. This would account completely for the text of the MSS. and if the supplement of 'the land' is somewhat hard, it may fairly be said that some such quality might be expected in the true original, since otherwise where was the temptation to so grotesque a blunder

as we actually find? But this reading, together with every reading and every exposition of the passage, is open to a far graver question, a question which could never have been passed over or dismissed, as it is, with perfunctory answers, if modern students could but be persuaded to take Euripides seriously. 'Why should the chorus wish to go to Egypt?' asks Mr. Cruickshank, by way of recommending our acceptance of the statement that Paphos was fertilized by the Nile. But why indeed should they wish to go there? And why should they wish themselves in Paphos? Or rather how dare these bacchantes, situated as they are and assuming the style and claims which they do assume, how dare they for an instant to entertain such thoughts, and how can they have the consummate impudence to express them? It is no doubt true, as some of the commentaries tell us, that the worship of Dionysus was found both in Cyprus and in Egypt, as indeed some form of it was found in every part of the Hellenic and the Hellenistic world. It is also true that on one side the multiform worship of Dionysus had affinities with that of Aphrodite, and that therefore in such a country as Cyprus, where Aphrodite was dominant, the *orgia* were liable to a close association with *Aphrodisia*. But it is also true that if the bacchantes depicted by Euripides were prepared to admit and welcome such an association, much more if it were the aim of their favourite aspirations, then the whole tragedy is false, futile, and baseless, then it is impossible to credit the poet with any serious meaning or purpose; he was not thinking of his subject, but only playing with it, and the finer his sentiments, the more profane they are.

For what is the issue which the play puts before us? Simply this, whether the true worship of Dionysus, as preached by the god, is or is not a worship exciting to the sexual emotions; whether it is or is not allied in tendency and connected in fact with the worship of Aphrodite. This is the charge which Pentheus makes repeatedly and in express terms, and upon which he bases his proscription and persecution of the new rites; that the Bacchanal fervour, though in name religious, is merely a cover for unchastity: *πρόφασιν μὲν ὡς δὴ μαινάδας θυοσκοῦσιν, | τὴν δ' Ἀφροδίτην πρόσθ' ἄγειν τοῦ Βακχίου*. In every scene, between Pentheus and Teiresias, between Pentheus and Dionysus, between Pentheus and the messenger from Cithaeron, the dialogue turns upon this cardinal point. The name of

Aphrodite or Cypris occurs repeatedly, as the symbol of that imputation which the persecutor alleges and the sectaries deny (*vv.* 225, 236, 315, 459, 688). Not anywhere, unless it be in the passage which we are investigating, do the bacchantes, or any one for whose opinions they are responsible, acknowledge any connexion between their deity and the deities of sex. Even such a distant and secondary relation between them as is indicated by the herdsman in his *οἶνον δὲ μηκέτ' ὄντος οὐκ ἔστιν Κύπρις* (773) receives no justification either from the deity or his initiated worshippers; and moreover the herdsman is no authorized exponent of Bacchus. His conclusion, from which we have just cited, is not unreasonably treated by Pentheus as a fresh provocation, and it betrays, like much in the speeches of Cadmus and Teiresias, a very imperfect idea of the new religion as it appears in the language of its true adepts. According to them, the inspiration of Bacchus is a purely mystic religious enthusiasm, cherished partly for its own intense delight and partly for the sublime and rapturous meditations with which it is connected. Even wine, which is by no means universally prominent in their discourse, serves rather as a type than as a necessary instrument of that physical, mental, and moral elevation, which can sustain itself equally well upon honey, or milk, or water (*vv.* 704-711): and of sexual feeling or stimulus there is not, nor reasonably could there be, one single authoritative word.

Surely then it ought to stagger us, when we find the bacchantes, in the midst of their protest against the blindness and blasphemy of their opponents, in the midst of their appeals to the spirit of holiness and professions of trust in providence, break out on a sudden into the passionate cry, 'Oh that I could be in the island of Aphrodite, in the city inhabited by the heart-melting minions of Love!' If Pentheus had heard them, what could he say but that in their own despite, forced out of their hypocrisy by the pressure of their genuine feelings, they had confessed the very substance of his charge?

And this objection would hold, even if the language here used were susceptible of an innocent sense, and intended by the speakers, in some obscure and mystical way, to be innocently interpreted. The horrible punishment of Pentheus is inflicted upon him for spiritual blindness, for uncharitableness and tyrannical haste in persecuting upon the faith of a misconception. That

such offences do sometimes entail a fearful penalty, even upon men not ill-intentioned, is perfectly true, and is a legitimate foundation for tragedy. But in order that the tragedy so founded may be legitimate, and that our sympathies may be properly engaged, it is essential that there should be a fair human possibility of avoiding the mistake which is punished. Pentheus asserts the *thiasus* to be an instrument of sexual temptation and sexual corruption. That it was liable by aberration to become such, not the most sincere and devout Macedonian or Phrygian believer could have denied. It is only too certain that almost everywhere the Dionysiac religion, however pure and exalted in its proper intention, had a tendency to become, and did in the end become, just what Pentheus affirms it to be. Like all enthusiastic forms of religion, it was exposed to this abuse, and therefore in a manner justly exposed to the imputation. But the better class of its devotees of course contended, and the whole sense of the *Bacchae* depends on our accepting the view, that such practices were in fact an abuse only and not a true use of their religion. And what practical person could be expected to believe this for a moment, if to the sufficiently equivocal and perilous acts of the bacchic *propaganda* were added the familiar adoption of a style and language which to any common apprehension must appear to interpret *in malam partem* the ambiguous acts?

But it is needless to consider what would be the effect of taking these sentences in an innocent sense, for in fact they are incapable of any such sense. Aphrodite, though not much admired by sober people, either in Athens or generally in Hellas, had no doubt one respectable aspect and some decent cults. But the name of Paphos is clear of all ambiguity. The goddess of Paphos was the declared patroness of every sexual extravagance, and her Phoenician rites were a system of scientific debauchery. For an honest maid or matron, to wish herself in Paphos would be simply to give her character away. If Euripides could put such a sentiment into the mouths of his bacchanals at this moment, he was writing at random, without purpose and even without meaning; and really it does not matter what he said.

But to escape this difficulty, there is a way so perfectly simple that it would have been found directly, if it had ever been sought. The sentiments in question are not adopted by the bacchanals at all, but on the contrary

are cited by them only to be emphatically damned and reprobated. The paragraph does not begin, as is supposed, at v. 402 *ἰκοίμαν ποτὶ Κύπρον κ.τ.λ.*, but two lines before, at v. 400, the sense overlapping the strophae, as it not unfrequently does. The correct punctuation is this :

μαινομένων οἶδε τρόποι
καὶ κακοβούλων παρ' ἔμοιγε φωτῶν
'ἰκοίμαν ποτὶ Κύπρον,
νᾶσον τὰς Ἀφροδίτας,
ἐν ᾗ θελξίφρονες νέμονται
θνατοῖσιν Ἑρώτες
Πάφον θ' ἢ ἄν ἑκατόστομοι
βαρβάρων ποταμοῦ ῥοαὶ
καρπίζουσιν ἄνομβροι.
ὅπου δ' ἂ καλλιστενομένα κ.τ.λ.

Mad fools, in my esteem, and mischievous are they, who went to cry 'Oh that I were in Cyprus, the isle of Aphrodite, oh to be in Paphos, [or the land of the Nile]!' No! There, where in Pieria is the noblest seat of meditation, Olympus' solemn slope, thither lead me, Bromius, our divine fore-runner. There is the 'charm' and the 'passion' for us; there the fit place for the women of Bacchus to do their rite.

The seat of Aphrodite-worship, and of such corrupted *bacchanalia* as might flourish beside it, is contrasted with the northern border of Greece, the seat, as the poet of the *Bacchae* repeatedly implies, of religion in a singularly pure, simple, and genuine form, of a religion for which, as he seems to imply, it was really possible to forecast and desire a great future. And a future it had indeed. But this is a subject far too large for this place.

That v. 400 begins a paragraph is properly indicated by the absence of any copula.¹ The quotation *ἰκοίμαν... ἄνομβροι* stands in loose, but perfectly intelligible, apposition to *τρόποι*. For a bolder application of the same principle see Aristoph. *Wasps* 666, *τούτους τοὺς οὐχὶ προδώσω τὸν Ἀθηναίων κολοσυρτόν.* In v. 409 the *δέ*, which on the common hypothesis many would rightly change to *τε*, is now seen to be necessary. Whether *ὅπου* should be *οὗ* is a purely metrical question, and may be here passed over.

Now when we see the passage in its true bearing, we shall no longer seek, in vv. 406-408, for regions with which the religion professed by these bacchanals might best and most properly be associated, but merely for regions dominated by Aphrodite; and this has an important bearing on the interpretation of v. 406. The land of the

¹ Porson, rightly on the common hypothesis, wished to put one in.

Nile, as a whole, did not appertain especially to Aphrodite; the land which did so appertain was the *Delta*, with its Graeco-Phoenician population, and its sanctuary situated, just above the separation of the streams, at Memphis. And it is the Delta (note *ἐκατόστομοι*) to which the words refer. This being so, though I would willingly accept Prof. Tyrrell's reading and translation, in default of another, I think the principle of it may be modified so as to get rid of its only difficulty. I would read *νᾶσον τὰς Ἀφροδίτας ἐν ᾧ...νέμονται...Ἐρωτες Πάφον, ἃν θ' ἐκατόστομοι...ῥοαὶ καρπίζουσι*: 'the isle of Aphrodite, wherein is the Paphian home of the heart-melting minions of Love, or that [other isle], which the strange stream's hundred mouths make rich without aid of rain.' Since the Delta is in fact an island, though not of the common type, it is not unnatural that, where it is to be linked with Cyprus, its sister in religious affinity, this point of resemblance should be utilized. With *ἄν* therefore we are to supply, not artificially *γὰν*, but simply from the context *νᾶσον*. We may still do this no doubt with Prof. Tyrrell's *Πάφον θ', ἃν θ'*, though the correlation of *ἐν ᾧ...ἄν τε*...is not then, I think, so manifest. In the antistrophic verse (421) we shall of course retain *ἴσα* with both MSS.

However it is far from my purpose to

argue against Prof. Tyrrell, from whom comes the one gleam of light which has hitherto been thrown on the passage. Nor would I quarrel with Mr. Cruickshank, who here does at least ask, though not with the best intentions, the only question much worth asking: 'Why should the bacchanals wish to be in Egypt?' To this question no tolerable answer has been or will be given. It is not even true that the bacchanal religion was essentially or distinctively connected with Egypt, and still less true that it was so connected with Cyprus, although those countries, like almost every part of the ancient world, exhibited, in more or less purity, the effects of that extraordinary and profoundly important 'revival.' Nor would such a connexion, if it existed, explain at all why the chorus of Euripides' play should here choose out of all the world those very regions which, to judge by their professions, they must in a religious point of view regard as the most dangerous and least desirable.

Such and not less vital are the problems of which many lie everywhere still unsolved before the serious student of Euripides. One by one they will have to be solved before we shall comprehend his significance, or be truly entitled to judge him. But to pass them over is merely to put back the clock.

A. W. VERRALL.

JOHN ii. 20. Τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἑξ ἔτεσιν ᾠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος.

THE Rev. renders this, 'Forty and six years was this temple (marg. "sanctuary") in building'; Bishop Lightfoot (*Biblical Essays*, p. 30), 'has been forty-six years in building'; Westcott (*John*, ad loc.), "In forty and six years was this temple built" as we now see it,' adding, 'the work was regarded as complete in its present state, though the reparation of the whole structure was not completed till thirty-six years afterwards'; Dr. Sanday (*Fourth Gospel*, p. 66), 'We might almost paraphrase it, "Forty-six years is it since the building of this Temple began, [and is not yet finished]".'

None of these critics refer to the theory (just touched on, but not discussed, by the *Horae Hebraicae*, ad loc.) that Ezra's temple is contemplated, and that the meaning may be paraphrased as follows, 'This temple, as we have heard from our forefathers, took

forty-six years to build, or, was forty-six years in building.' This theory I shall try to prove to be at least more probable than the Herodian, on grounds (1) linguistic, (2) historical, (3) *a priori*.

(1) Although the dative is sometimes used (in late Greek) to denote *extension* of time 'during' (as distinct from *limitation* 'within'), yet this construction appears to be confined to instances where the context makes the meaning of extension clear, e.g. Euseb. *H.E.* v. 1 πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν ἐν ταῖς Γαλλίαις διατρίψας, Boeckh. *Inscr.* 4107 ζησάσ[η] ἔτεσιν λε. Moreover, if the meaning were 'has been [and still is] a-building,' we should expect, not *ᾠκοδομήθη*, but *μς' ἦδη ἔτη οἰκοδομεῖται*. It is true that 2 Ezra v. 16 (in the report made to Darius concerning Ezra's temple) has ἀπὸ τότε ἕως τοῦ νῦν ᾠκοδομήθη καὶ οὐκ ἐτελέσθη, but this seems to be an attempt to render the participle of the original Hebrew